

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference CP 61061	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/012857	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 25 October 2004 (25.10.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 24 October 2003 (24.10.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant INSTITUT CURIE		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 *bis*.1(a).
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report 24 April 2006 (24.04.2006)
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Agnes Wittmann-Regis</div>
Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 70	

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 02 MAR 2005

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

6/5

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/012857

International filing date (day/month/year)
25.10.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
24.10.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
C12N15/11

Applicant
INSTITUT CURIE

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for International preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Hoff, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7895



Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/012857

Box No. II Priority

1. ☐ The following document has not been furnished:

☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☒ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
☒ claims Nos. 15, 1-12 (partially)

because:

- ☒ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 15 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

see separate sheet

- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 1-12 (partially) are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

see separate sheet

- ☒ the claims, or said claims Nos. 1-12 (partially) are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

- ☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.

- ☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| the written form | <input type="checkbox"/> has not been furnished |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> does not comply with the standard |
| the computer readable form | <input type="checkbox"/> has not been furnished |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> does not comply with the standard |

- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

- ☐ See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/012857

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	15
	No: Claims	1-14
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-14
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: Omori et al., 2002
D2: Ohnishi et al., 1998
D3: EP0978561

III.1 The subject matter of claim 15 relates to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1 (iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

For the assessment of the present claim 15 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

III.2 Present claims 1-12 relate to products defined by reference to a desirable characteristic or property, namely they are defined as being substrate for proteins involved in the NHEJ pathway.

The claims cover all products having this characteristic or property, whereas the application provides support within the meaning of Article 6 PCT and/or disclosure within the meaning of Article 5 PCT for only a very limited number of such products (table 1.1 of the description). In the present case, the claims so lack support, and the application so lacks disclosure, that a meaningful search over the whole of the claimed scope is impossible. Independent of the above reasoning, the claims also lack clarity (Article 6 PCT). An attempt is made to define the product/compound/method/apparatus by reference to a result to be achieved. Again, this lack of clarity in the present case is such as to render a meaningful search over the whole of the claimed scope impossible. Consequently, the search has been carried out for those parts of the claims which appear to be clear, supported and disclosed, namely those parts relating to the products mentioned in table

1.1 of the description.

V.1.1 Article 33(2) PCT

The molecules of claim 1 are not characterized by a single technical feature (i.e nucleic acid sequence) allowing to distinguish them from other already existing molecules of 4-1000 bp with a modified backbone. Attention is drawn to the Applicant that the molecules disclosed in claim 1 cannot be distinguished from other molecules of the prior art through their function since the function of a molecule is inherent to the molecule.

D1 and especially D3 (D3: p.2, l.32; p.3, l.55-p.4, l.1; p.4, l.30-p.5, l.58) disclose oligonucleotides which are chemically modified according to claims 1-12 of the present application. As a consequence the subject matter of claims 1-12 is not novel under Article 33(2) PCT.

D3 discloses also the use of said molecules as pharmaceuticals (D3: claim 20). Consequently the subject matter of claims 13 and 14 is also not considered as satisfying the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT.

V.1.2 Article 33(3) PCT

The subject matter of claims 1-14 is not novel therefore it is also not considered as satisfying the requirements of Article 33.3 PCT.

The examples and table 1.1 of the application provide a few molecules which are all chemically modified subsequences of DRIL 32. Said molecules were shown to solve the problem of the application and would form a basis for an allowable set of claims.